

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH
CENTRAL DIVISION

CHRISTENA WHITE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SCOTT JOHN OCKEY, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND
ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS FOR SERVICE OF
PROCESS

Case No. 2:06-CV-17 TS

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, has filed an Amended Complaint with seventeen causes of action. Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* has been granted. Plaintiff has now filed three Motions for Service of Process. The Court has completed the screening process set forth under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Having reviewed the pleadings in the file and being otherwise fully informed, the Court will deny two of Plaintiff's Motions for Service of Process and will grant one.

Plaintiff has filed three Motions for Service of Process.¹ Two of those Motions seek an order directing the United States Marshal's Service to serve process on individuals who are not parties to this case.² These individuals are not named Defendants in this matter and are not otherwise involved in this case as parties. Therefore, the Court will deny Plaintiff's Motions for Service of Process as to these individuals.

Plaintiff's third Motion for Service of Process seeks to have Defendant Ockey served with process. The Court will grant that Motion and will direct the United States Marshal's Service to serve process on Defendant Ockey.

It is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motions for Service of Process (Docket Nos. 4 and 6) are DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Service of Process (Docket No. 5) is GRANTED. The United States Marshall shall serve a copy of the complaint and summons upon the following defendants:

Scott John Ockey

All costs of service shall be advanced by the United States. It is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff shall serve upon the defendants, or if appearance has been entered by counsel, upon their attorney, a copy of every further pleading or other document submitted for consideration by the Court. Plaintiff shall include with the original paper to be filed with the clerk of the court a certificate stating the date that a true and correct copy of any


¹Docket Nos. 4, 5, and 6.

²Docket No. 4 names "State of Utah Securities Division Att: Michael Hines." Docket No. 6 names "State of Utah Attorney General's Office Att: Charlene Barlow."

document was mailed to the defendants or their legal counsel. Any paper received by a district judge or magistrate judge which fails to include a certificate of services will be disregarded by the Court.

DATED April 26, 2006.

BY THE COURT:



TED STEWART
United States District Judge